DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 898 SP 032 458

AUTHOR Page, Fred M., Jr.; Page, Jane A.
TITLE Teachers' Perceptions of the Teaching Profession and Educational Reform.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 64p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990). Sponsored by the University System of Regents Special Initiating Funding Grant.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the views of teachers in 40 school systems in the service area of Southeast Georgia (SEGA) on teaching as a career and a variety of educational reform issues. Specific questions addressed by the study were: (1) How do teachers in SEGA perceive the teaching profession as a career opportunity? (2) How do SEGA teachers perceive various proposals for educational reform? (3) Do SEGA teachers, categorized on the basis of background variables, differ in their perceptions of the teaching profession and educational reform? (4) Are there background variables which discriminate independently or in combination between SEGA teachers who would choose teaching again and those who would not? and (5) Are there items related to perceptions of teaching which discriminate independently or in combination between SEGA teachers who would choose teaching again and those who would not? Most respondents viewed contributions to humanity, job availability, and job security as encouraging factors. Thirteen suggested reforms were viewed positively and nine negatively, and there were numerous differences in perceptions of teaching factors and reforms. Summaries of teacher recommendations are included. Three appendices contain the instrument, "Perceptions of Teaching and Educational Reform"; 10 tables; and a list of 17 references. (Author/JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED320898

# TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

*Fred M. Page, Jr.*
*Jane A. Page*
Georgia Southern College

A Paper Presented at the
American Educational Research Association's 1990 Annual Meeting
Session 12.02
April 17, 1990
Boston, Massachusetts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. A. Page
Fred M. Page, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was funded by the University System of Regents
Special Initative Funding Grant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP032 458

# The Teaching Profession and Educational Reform: Perceptions of Teachers in Southeast Georgia

## Introduction

Teachers and teaching during the 1980's have been a studied entity. Queries and opinions have eminated from a variety of sources: legislatures, special interest groups, lay citizenry, business communities, etc. The very nature of American public education lends itself to scrutiny and recommendations from such sources.

Public concern with mediocrity in education escalated in the spring of 1983 with the release of A NATION AT RISK. "Since 1983 the states have generated more rules and regulations about all aspects of education than in the previous 20 years. Nationwide more than 700 state statutes affecting some aspect of the teaching profession were enacted between 1984 and 1986" (Timar and Kirp, 1989).

Significant ideas for the improvement of education, in these times of reform, often emerge from non-educators. "The National Commission on Excellence in Education. . .had ample business representation while classroom teachers were given one slot on a commission of 33 individuals" (Romanish, 1987). In Georgia, a similar scenario is recognized in the development of the Quality Basic Education Act. Although an intricate network for communication with the state's teachers was devised, the initial, formally appointed committee had a membership reflecting the national image in relation to teacher representation.

Along with public education, teachers are "under the microscope." And, the resulting image may best be described as kaleidoscopic. The most accurate view, however, may come from those being observed, the teachers themselves.

Teachers and teaching have received broad analytical coverage. In specific terms, geographically, what is the current status of teachers and teaching? This study was designed to elicit information relative to teaching as a career opportunity and in regard to a variety of educational reform issues. A wide range of descriptive data is available on these topics. Studies have been generated that offer national perspectives. State-wide views are available in many areas. A purpose of this study, however, was to establish a knowledge base of information restricted by geographical parameters. Population, then, was confined to the 40 county service area of the Southern Teacher Education Center. The area, in general terms, may be

referred to as southeast Georgia (SEGA). A very specific intent guided geographic delineation: What are the views of THESE teachers? Specific questions addressed by this research study are listed below:

1. How do teachers in southeast Georgia perceive the teaching profession as a career opportunity?
2. How do SEGA teachers perceive various proposals for educational reform?
3. Do SEGA teachers, categorized on the basis of background variables, differ in their perceptions of the teaching profession and educational reform?
4. Are there background variables which discriminate independently or in combination between SEGA teachers who would choose teaching again and those who would not?
5. Are there items related to perceptions of teaching which discriminate independently or in combination between SEGA teachers who would choose teaching again and those who would not?

## Background: A Discussion of Relevant Literature

Two areas of relevant literature related to the objectives of this study are: (1) the teaching profession as a career opportunity, and (2) reform in the teaching profession. The sections below provide summaries of some of the related literature and research in these areas.

### The Teaching Profession as a Career Opportunity

The authors of this report have been involved with researching this topic since 1980. The need for research was originally stimulated by a declining teacher education enrollment and a predicted teacher shortage in Georgia. The authors have since surveyed high school seniors, preservice teachers at various points in their preparation and inservice teachers throughout the southeastern United States. Additionally, former State Teachers of the Year from all 50 states were surveyed. Findings of these research projects have been published in various journals (see bibliography) and presented at numerous educational conferences. Four of the major findings are listed below:

1. A predictive factor in whether high school seniors choose teaching as a future career is simply whether or not anyone has discussed the career possibility with them.

2. Females and Blacks generally view the teaching profession in a more positive manner than do white males.

3. Encouraging factors related to teaching as identified by high school seniors, preservice teachers, inservice teachers and state teachers of the year included: contributions to humanity, job security, and fringe benefits.

4. Major discouraging factors identified by high school seniors, preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and state teachers of the year included salary, discipline problems, and working conditions.

Other researchers have conducted similar studies. According to a report by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985), inadequate salaries, limited advancement opportunities, stressful work environments, and lack of status and autonomy discourage many of the best students from ever considering careers in teaching. The same factors cause many teachers to exit the profession after a few years. Unfortunately, this is often when their skills are highly developed and their potential contributions are the greatest. Three specific findings by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education are reported:

> In 1981, in response to, "If you could go back and start all over again, would you still become a teacher?" almost 40% of the respondents said, "No." This rate of dissatisfaction was four times higher than teachers indicated twenty years ago.
>
> The level of dissatisfaction among secondary school teachers was significantly higher than among their elementary school colleagues. The percent of secondary teachers expressing dissatisfaction with salaries was twice as high (50% versus 25%); the percent expressing dissatisfaction with administrative support was ten times as high (40% versus 4%).
>
> Eighty-seven percent of teachers leaving the profession cited inadequate salaries as a factor in their resignations. Of almost equal importance was the universal perception that society did not highly value the contribution they were making. "It's the only job in the world," said one teacher, "in which you read in the paper in the morning what an awful job you are doing."

A report of special interest to Georgians was released prior to the nation's intensive scrutiny of the profession after A NATION AT RISK. The Darden Corporation was commissioned in 1981 by the Governor of Georgia to study problems in the profession. A major problem in the schools, according to these teachers who had exited the profession, was the leadership provided (or not provided) by school principals. Poor salary was also cited as a primary concern (Darden, 1981). The importance of the administration to the profession has more recently been confirmed by the effective schools research.

A more recent state-wide study of the teaching profession as a career opportunity was conducted by Linda Jordan, Coordinator of Teacher Recruitment. Jordan surveyed seniors from 54 high schools in the state. The factors that were the strongest positive influences for students interested in teaching were competence and interest in the subject they would teach and working with students. The most important factors to uninterested students were better teacher salaries, opportunities for promotion and student respect. "In addition to identifying factors which influence students to consider or reject teaching, the results of this study indicated that a lower percentage of the students were interested in teaching careers, teaching continued to appeal to white females, and students selecting education as a career choice were academically inferior to the other groups based on test scores" (Jordan, 1988).

The research indicates that perceptions of teaching as a career have been rather negative for several years. Amelioration of this problem in perceptions is important since the perception of one's role is positively correlated with one's productivity in that role.

Reform in the Teaching Profession

A primary theme in the educational reform literature is the need to strengthen the teaching profession. Three reports addressing professionalism are those released by the Holmes Group (1986), the Carnegie Forum (1986), and the National Governor's Association (1986). Other reports, including those provided by Gallup Polls, identify specific concerns related to the teaching profession.

The Holmes Group is a consortium of chief academic officers and education teams from major research universities. The report, entitled TOMORROW'S TEACHERS, proposed five goals.

1. To make the education of teachers more intellectually sound; to make prospective teachers thoughtful students of teaching and its improvement.

2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, and in their education, certification, work, and career opportunities by distinguishing among novices, competent professional teachers, and high-level professional leaders.

3. To create standards of entry to the profession (examinations and educational requirements) that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible.

4. To connect institutions of higher and professional education with schools in order to make better use of expert teachers.

5. To make schools better places for teachers to work and for students to learn by altering the professional roles and responsibilities of teachers.

To achieve these goals the Holmes Group proposed to abolish undergraduate teacher education programs, require that all future teachers have a liberal arts major, and to reestablish teacher education as a graduate program. Additionally, the Holmes Group has proposed a three-step career ladder for teachers.

The report has generated considerable controversy. One concern is the effect the report will have on education programs in institutions that do not have graduate programs. Additionally, the report is ambiguous about how its proposal to restrict a teacher's field of instruction to his or her major and minor fields is to be translated at the elementary level of instruction. "The implication of this proposal would seem to be that the self-contained classroom will need to be abandoned even in the primary grades" (Feinberg, 1987). A concern related to the career ladder proposal is the elitism it seems to reflect.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy released in 1986 A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21st CENTURY. The report has similar recommendations to the Holmes report. The career ladder concept, for example, is present. The Carnegie Forum proposed a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (now at work) to plan this career ladder. "The ladder would start

licensed teachers at $15,000 for ten months, paying more for experienced certified teachers, paying still more for advanced certified teachers, and finally, paying 'lead' teachers $72,000 for twelve months to direct other teachers and to run schools" (Parker, 1987).

The Carnegie report differs from the Holmes report in its emphasis on the relationship between education and economics.

> Thus, whereas the Holmes Group has provided a report about the educational needs of the teaching profession and the structural changes that must be made to meet them, the Carnegie Forum has provided a statement about the competitive position of the United States in the international market and has elaborated the educational changes that improving this position would entail (Feinberg, 1987).

TIME FOR RESULTS: THE GOVERNORS' 1991 REPORT ON EDUCATION is the report released in 1986 by the National Governors' Association. The following ideas from the report were summarized by this association's chair, Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee (Alexander, 1986).

1. Now is the time to work out a fair affordable career ladder system that recognizes real differences in function, competence, and performance of teachers.
2. States should create leadership programs for school leaders.
3. Parents should have more choice in the public schools their children attend.
4. The nation -- and the states and school districts -- need better report cards about results, about what students know and can do.
5. School districts and schools that don't make the grade should be declared bankrupt, taken over by the state and reorganized.
6. It makes no sense to keep closed half a year the school buildings in which America has invested a quarter of a trillion dollars while we are undereducated and overcrowded.
7. States should work with four- and five-year-olds from poor families to help them get ready for school and to decrease the chances that they will drop out later.

8. Better use of technologies through proper planning and training for use of videodiscs, computers, and robotics is an important way to give teachers more time to teach.

9. States should insist that colleges assess what students actually learn while in college.

Although the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and the Governors' Association have formally proposed reforms, they are not, of course, the only groups desiring changes. In fact, the general public, according to a 1988 Gallup Poll, is encouraging reform in the teaching profession. Although the American public gave relatively high grades to teachers, the Gallup surveys still show a demand for higher standards and requirements for teaching personnel. In the 1988 poll, 86% of the public favored requiring experienced teachers to pass a statewide test of basic competence in their subject areas. Five previous education polls showed across-the-board support for teacher competency testing.

The 1988 poll asked the public whether or not they would favor the establishment of a national set of standards for the certification of public school teachers. The proposal was favored by 86% of the public. Additionally, 84% favored some type of increased pay scale for teachers that have proven themselves particularly capable. However, a smaller majority (51%) thought that it was a "good idea" to require teachers to spend one year as interns in the schools at half pay before they are given certificates to teach (Gallup, 1988).

The influence of all of these reports is still uncertain. And of course, there are no guarantees that the proposals, if implemented, will provide the results predicted by the groups. State legislatures have established mandates which include some of these reforms as well as many others. A primary factor in the effectiveness of these reforms will be the endorsement (or lack of it) from individuals in the profession.

## METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted during the 1988-89 academic year. The background research and a pilot study were conducted during Fall, 1988. Revisions in instrumentation were made and revised instruments were administered to the population during April, 1989. Instruments were returned and data analyzed during

the following weeks. A discussion of the subjects, instrumentation, and data analysis follows.

Subjects

The target area for study consisted of 40 school systems in the southeastern portion of Georgia. Using a stratified random sampling technique, 64 schools were selected for participation. Superintendents in the systems were contacted for permission to survey the selected schools and 36 (85%) agreed. Surveys were returned by 56 (87.5%) of the schools. A total of 1436 (60%) of the surveys were completed by teachers in participating schools.

Instrumentation

The instrument, "Perceptions of Teaching and Educational Reform," was developed by the researchers using factors and reform proposals that were emphasized in current professional literature. It included items in three areas.

SECTION I included 16 controlled-choice items. These items requested background information related to the individual's preparation, teaching position, and personal characteristics.

SECTION II provided an opportunity for teachers to identify their perceptions of teaching as a career. The first ten items requested that respondents identify the level of encouragement of various factors related to teaching. The ten factors were:

| | |
|---|---|
| certification requirements | parental support |
| contributions to humanity | salary |
| fringe benefits | social status |
| job availability | student cooperation |
| job security | working conditions |

Other items in this section asked teachers to rate their level of enjoyment of teaching for themselves and others and the appropriateness of the teaching profession for themselves and others. The final item in this section asked teachers to determine whether or not they would choose teaching again if they could start all over.

SECTION III included 22 items identifying the reforms that have been proposed by various interest groups. Respondents were requested to rate their level of agreement. The reforms included were:

abolition of undergraduate major in education
career ladders with differentiated salaries in relation to accomplishments
certification based on classroom performance
differentiated staffing; certified teachers assisted by interns, instructors, paraprofessionals, etc.
higher teacher salaries
increased academic curriculum in high schools
less emphasis on athletics and other extra-curricular activities
longer school days
longer school years
mentor teachers to assist and supervise beginning teachers
more federal funding for education programs
more state funding for education programs
national board certification process
partnerships between colleges/universities and community schools
public education for four-year-olds
requirement for students to do homework
requirement of five years for collegiate teacher training
restriction of teachers to instructing only in their subject matter major
standardized testing of teachers as a basis for teacher credentializing and licensing
standardized testing of students at every grade level
standardized test scores used in determining student promotion
state standardization of curriculum

In addition to the controlled-choice items on the instrument, an open-ended item enabled teachers to provide comments related to the teaching profession and educational reform. A copy of the complete instrument is included in Appendix A.

Analysis of Data

The researchers used several statistical procedures to analyze the data. Frequency statistics were used to determine the population's responses to background information, perceptions of teaching as a career opportunity, and views of educational reform considerations. Discriminant analysis was employed to

determine which variables were most predictive of teachers' levels of satisfaction with career choice. Analyses of variance were computed to determine differences in perceptions of groups of teachers categorized on the basis of background variables. Additionally, open-ended responses were analyzed using a qualitative categorization approach.

## Results

The responses to items on the instrument were analyzed using a variety of statistical procedures including frequency statistics, analysis of variance, and discriminant analyses. The findings are reported in three areas: background information, perceptions of teaching as a career opportunity, and perceptions of educational reform considerations.

### Background Information

#### Frequencies

The respondents provided a pool of subjects with varying backgrounds and instructional settings. For example, 24.8% had from 0 to 5 years experience, 18.9% had from 6 to 10 years experience, 21.6% had from 11 to 15 years experience, 18.5% had from 16 to 20 years experience and 16.2% had greater than 20 years experience. Other specific information related to community size, school size, organizational structure of school, sex, race, etc. can be found on Table 1 in Appendix B.

In an effort to determine people that were influential in the decision to teach, the researchers included an item requesting identification of the most influential person in the subject's decision. Family member was identified by 36.5%, high school teacher by 22.9%, elementary teacher by 16.2%, other by 10.8%, and friend by 9.7%. Other categories of personnel listed on the survey were identified by less than 2%.

Another item asked subjects to identify family members serving in the field of education. Less than half (47.8%) had no immediate family member in the field of education. The most common responses were sister (22.7%), mother (18.9%), and spouse (15.9%).

A large number of subjects developed an interest in teaching at an early age; 19.8% were younger than 12, 15.6% were from 12 to 15, and 25.9% were from

16 to 18. Some (7.8%), however, did not develop an interest in teaching until after the age of 25.

Discriminant Analysis

The 17 background variables were identified as factors in a discriminant analysis in an effort to predict individuals that were highly satisfied with their career choice (i.e., those that would choose teaching as a career if they could start all over). The background variables combined to predict subjects into four groups (those that responded yes, possibly, doubtfully, or no) with only a 35% accuracy. When responses were recoded into two groups (1. yes or possibly, and 2. doubtfully or no), the background variables served as slightly better predictors with a 59.26% accuracy. Although the combined variables served as rather poor predictors, several individual variables were identified as being significant predictors of career choice satisfaction. These were: organization of school, grades taught, number of preparations, degree held, field of certification, age first interested, current age, sex, and years experience. Tables 2 and 3 provide specific statistical information.

Perceptions of Teaching

Frequencies

The subjects responded to 17 items related to teaching as a career choice. Table 4 presents percentages for each of these items. The factors related to the teaching profession that were viewed as most encouraging were: (a) contributions to humanity, (b) job security, and (c) job availability. Factors viewed as most discouraging were: (a) salary, (b) parental support, and (c) student cooperation.

A large majority reported that they enjoyed teaching either all of the time (12.3%) or most of the time (69.9%). Many clarified this response with comments that differentiated between teaching and non-teaching duties. A little over half (51.8%) of the subjects agreed that teaching is a good career for females, while 26.8% responded "yes" to the idea that teaching is a good career for males.

When asked whether they would encourage an interested daughter to pursue teaching, only 24.4% responded affirmatively while 29.9% said "no." Others indicated that this was possible (29%) or doubtful (16.7%). Even fewer (14.8%) would encourage an interested son, with others responding to this statement in more negative categories: possibly (22.2%), doubtfully (19.1%) and no (43.9%).

Respondents evaluated their own career choice by responding to the question: "If you could start all over again, would you choose teaching as a career?" Only 23.7% answered with a definite "yes" while others responded: possibly (33%), doubtfully (22%) and no (21.4%).

Differences Between Groups

Analyses of variance were computed to determine differences in perceptions of teaching between groups of subjects categorized on the basis of background variables. There were 120 significant differences, at the .05 level, in perceptions of teaching as identified by responses to 17 items. Table 5 identifies specific statistical results. Five variables (population of community, highest degree attained, age, race, and years of teaching experience) produced more than 10 significant differences each.

There were 11 significant differences between teachers from communities of varying sizes. Teachers from communities with populations numbering 10,000 to 20,000 were generally more positive about their profession than other teachers. Four of the factors viewed as significantly more encouraging were fringe benefits, job security, social status, and working conditions. Teachers from urban areas were generally the most negative.

There were 12 significant differences between perceptions of teachers categorized on the basis of highest degree attained. Generally, teachers with Bachelors degrees answered items more positively than teachers with Masters degrees. Five factors that were viewed more positively by these teachers were certification requirements, fringe benefits, social status, student cooperation, and working conditions.

Twelve significant differences were found between groups of teachers categorized on the basis of age. Younger teachers (21-30) were more encouraged by contributions to humanity, fringe benefits, and job security. Additionally, these teachers answered items more positively that related to teaching being a good career choice. However, older teachers (51-60) were more positive about certification requirements, parental support, and salary. Additionally, these teachers reported a significantly higher level of enjoyment of teaching. Mid-age teachers (31-40, 41-50) were significantly more negative in their perceptions of teaching.

There were fourteen significant differences between black and white teachers' perceptions of teaching as a career opportunity. Black teachers were more positive about certification requirements, contributions to humanity, parental support, salary, social status, student cooperation, and working conditions. Additionally, they reported greater enjoyment of teaching and a higher perception of teaching as a good career for females and males. On the other hand, white teachers were more likely to respond positively to the question asking them if they would choose teaching again. Additionally, white teachers were more encouraged by job security and were more likely to encourage an interested daughter.

There were 11 significant differences between perceptions of teachers categorized on the basis of years of teaching experience. Beginning teachers tended to be more positive about factors related to the teaching profession. One important exception was their view of certification requirements. This factor was perceived as significantly more discouraging by these new teachers. The teachers that were most discouraged overall were those in mid-career.

Discriminant Analysis

The first sixteen items related to perceptions were identified as factors in a discriminant analysis in an effort to predict individuals that were highly satisfied with their career choice (i.e. those that would choose teaching as a career if they could start all over). Summary information is identified on Table 6. The sixteen factors combined to predict subjects into four groups (yes, possibly, doubtfully, and no) with only 51% accuracy. However, when responses were recoded into two groups (1-yes or possibly, 2-doubtfully or no), the prediction rate was 78%. When these factors were examined independently, all were significant at the .05 level (see Table 7). The sixteen factors combine with the background variables to predict with a 56% (four group) and a 79.8% (two group) accuracy those that would choose teaching again. Summary information for the combined background and perceptions factors is found on Table 8.

Educational Reform Considerations

Frequencies

The subjects responded to twenty-two items identifying their level of agreement with educational reform considerations. Specific percentages for each item are indicated on Table 9. Some of the major findings are identified below:

1. Reforms receiving strongest agreement included those related to increased salary and funding, use of mentor teachers, and differentiated staffing.

2. A large majority (83.7%) disagreed with the proposal to abolish the undergraduate major in education. Additionally, 73.8% disagreed with requiring five years of collegiate teacher training.

3. Proposals for utilization of standardized tests were viewed negatively by these teachers: 60.9% disagreed with standardized testing of teachers as a basis for credentializing and licensing; 67.5% disagreed with the standardized testing of students at every grade level; and 72.3% disagreed with the use of standardized test scores in determining student promotion.

4. Although teachers disagreed with features of standardized test utilization, the majority (70.7%) agreed with state standardization of curriculum.

5. While essentially all respondents (99.7%) agreed with proposals for higher teacher salaries, a majority (52.6%) disagreed with career ladders that would differentiate salaries in relation to accomplishments. Additionally, two other proposals that could increase annual salaries, longer school days and longer school years, were viewed negatively.

Differences Between Groups

Analyses of variance were calculated to determine significant differences, at the .05 level, between groups of teachers categorized on the basis of 15 background variables. There were 177 significant differences in perceptions of 22 reforms. Table 10 identifies specific statistical results. Eight variables (population of community, school organization, grade level taught, type of certification, field of certification, present age, sex, and years experience) produced more than 10 significant differences each.

There were 13 significant differences between teachers categorized on the basis of population of community. Generally, subjects from urban areas more strongly

agreed with the educational reform proposals. Teachers from communities with populations from 10,000 to 20,000 were generally more negative about these proposals.

There were 17 differences between teachers from schools with varying organization plans (i.e., elementary, middle school, high school, or combination). The differences were very similar to those found between groups of teachers categorized according to grade level taught, type of certification, and field of certification. Teachers that were employed, teaching and certified at the high school level identified a higher level of agreement than other teachers with some proposals including: abolition of the undergraduate education major, career ladder programs, performance based certification, longer school days and years, requiring students to do homework, requiring five years of collegiate teacher training, restriction of teachers to their subject matter, and reforms related to the use of standardized tests. Teachers in elementary schools were more likely to favor mentor teacher programs, increased federal assistance, and partnerships between colleges/universities and community schools. Middle school teachers tended to be in stronger agreement with higher teacher salaries, increased academic curriculum, and national board certification.

There were 16 significant differences between groups categorized on the basis of age and 16 differences between groups categorized on the basis of years of experience. Since there appears to be a close correlation between age and experience of these subjects and the differences reflected this, these two areas are discussed together. Younger teachers (21 to 30) and teachers with minimum experience (0 to 5 years) tended to identify very strong agreement with the following factors: career ladders, performance based certification, differentiated staffing, higher teacher salaries, increased academic curriculum, mentor teachers, more federal and state funding, national board certification, and partnerships between colleges/universities and community schools. Teachers over 40 and teachers with more than 15 years experience were more likely to favor less emphasis on athletics and a longer school year.

There were 11 significant differences between males' and females' perceptions of educational reform considerations. Males were more likely to favor abolition of

the undergraduate education major, longer school days and years, requirement of students to do homework, and use of standardized test scores in determining student promotion. Female subjects were more likely to agree with increased academic curriculum, less emphasis on athletics, mentor teachers, more federal funding, national board certification, and public education for four year olds.

Summary of Results

1. The majority of respondents viewed contributions to humanity, job availability and job security as encouraging factors. Other factors related to the teaching career were viewed as discouraging by a majority of the respondents.

2. Thirteen of the reforms were viewed positively by a majority of subjects while nine were viewed negatively.

3. There were numerous differences in perceptions of teaching factors and reforms between various groups categorized on the basis of background variables.

4. Background variables tend to be unsatisfactory predictors of satisfaction with career choice while views of specific factors related to teaching are better predictors.

## Teacher Recommendations

Comments and recommendations were provided by many of the teachers. A qualitative categorization approach led to ten major recommendations. These recommendations along with explanations by the researchers and representative quotations from teachers are included.

**1. Teachers need more control over curriculum and methods in their own classrooms.** While recognizing the need for some curriculum standardization and for supervision and evaluation, teachers feel that they have unnecessary limitations.

> *When I started teaching 23 years ago, I was allowed to be flexible and use creativity in the instructional process. Now, we are told what we can and cannot teach to the point that we are very limited. I still love teaching but with all the added requirements and pressures from the state and local systems, we are made to feel that we can no longer meet individual needs of students. That's what teaching is all about.*

*I have always wanted to teach. I love to teach; however, the teaching profession has become so robotic that I don't feel like I'm in control anymore.*

*Please, let us teach! Just leave us alone to do what we do best -- interact with the students. Overall "guidelines" statewide are a must. However, consideration for "special needs" students are imperative! Give us more flexibility in the classroom.*

*The present drift is toward greater uniformity of instructional techniques, educational "outcomes," etc. Good teachers want greater freedom, more scope for creativity, and the liberty to respond to the needs of particular students and particular groups of students. Unfortunately, there seems to be a bureaucratic, "production" mentality behind current reform efforts (QBE, etc.) which pushes in exactly the opposite direction.*

**2. Teachers should be meaningfully involved in reform efforts.**

While teachers shun additional committee or staff meetings which occur under false pretense of actual teacher input, they welcome opportunities for meaningful involvement in decision-making.

*I strongly feel that educators must be included in decision making. Would you want a physician to repair your plumbing, or call your plumber to perform your open heart surgery?*

*Education in this county--perhaps in this state and country -- is entirely too top-heavy with bureaucracy. Anytime anyone tries to improve education, there are more unrealistic and inapplicable standards and requirements for teachers to spend their precious time meeting, while people hired to implement these "improving programs" are usually paid more than the teachers. Teachers receive a tacit message from our system that : a) they are not ever to be trusted as full-fledged professionals and b) the only people below them in the grand scale are lunchroom and custodial personnel. Teaching, therefore, is a job lacking in professional respect.*

*Curriculum should be improved, yes, but where will the decisions be made for improvement? The whole system needs to be pared down, brought back to basics, and made more realistic.*

*I would love to see a forum of teachers and state officials discussing the topics and survey questions mentioned on this form. I believe much good would come of it.*

*Education has changed, and who knows better than the classroom teacher? In the past, education within the state did not govern itself well. However, today we are prepared to do so, and can prove it, if given the opportunity. It's time for Governor Harris and the state to back off and let us teach with the assurance that we, as teachers, know what's best for ourselves and education.*

**3. Increased funding (especially teacher salaries) is a necessity.**

As in past studies conducted by these researchers and others, salary remains the most discouraging factor in the profession.

*The greatest detriment to obtaining quality teachers is the low salary and little hope of advancement financially.*

*Until "Quality" persons are attracted to education, teaching will not improve significantly! Salary is the major ingredient! According to the Nesbitt Group research, "Quality" persons in the work force will decline over the next several years and all "businesses" will be competing for the "best and brightest." Education has been and will continue to be on the lower end of the spectrum as the competition for the best workers continues.*

*Teacher pay is very inadequate for all the responsibility that we have. If we intend to keep Good Teachers, things better change.*

*I do not agree with all areas of QBE but some areas are very good if properly put into use. However, I feel negative results will advance unless QBE is funded sufficiently -- totally.*

*Decent salaries that facilitate the hiring of skilled aides to help with paperwork and recordkeeping are a must if the teacher is to have time and energy to teach well.*

**4. Paperwork and other non-teaching responsibilities must be reduced.** Negative comments related to paperwork and non-teaching duties were numerous. The words "let us teach" often accompanied these comments.

*I feel there is too much pressure on both teachers and administration to accomplish astronomical amounts of paperwork instead of educating the student.*

*I resent having a Masters Degree yet being asked to babysit at lunch time.*

*Reforms are needed in many areas but especially in the area of working conditions. Who would believe that I am forced to eat my lunch in seven minutes and am not given the opportunity to go to the restroom during the course of my work day? I work in a building that has one toilet for 46 women. I must serve as a police person and supervise a city street to ensure the safety of our students as they cross the street. I could go on but because of my limited time and space on this form, I will stop. I hope William Mangum will be encouraged to get out of the Atlanta area, into the real Georgia, and to take a look at working conditions.*

*Quit funding the "paper pushers". Put the money in the classroom. Raise teacher salaries and let teachers teach. Remove routine (mundane) tasks from a teacher's responsibility. The teacher's responsibility should be only to teach and keep appropriate records for his class.*

**5. Plans for improving parental support need to be devised and implemented.** Although teacher comments emphasized problems with parental support and involvement, solutions were not evident.

*This year I have experienced very poor attitudes from students and parents. There is very little desire to learn, disrespect toward teachers and lack of parental support. I, along with my co-workers, feel we are caught in a job where we are not able to successfully do the job we want to do. At the same time,we are talking of getting out as soon as possible.*

*Increasingly, the relationship between parents and educators is one of antagonism rather than cooperation.*

*Until the parent (home) becomes more involved and responsible for the child's development, I don't see very much improvement in our present educational system.*

**6. Needs of students, not standardized tests, must be the focal point of reform efforts.** While comments indicate that teachers are not against standardized student evaluation, they do feel that the current testing emphasis overshadows other important concerns.

*Children are the reason for education and I think the Board of Education should concentrate on the children, their needs, and reforms that are best for them. I also feel administration should stop trying to look so good on paper and concentrate on things like improving (lowering) teacher-student ratio, improving instruction, reducing testing requirements, decreasing daily subject requirements, reducing testing requirements for kindergarten and first grade, and stop increasing promotion requirements. In one word, simplify. Concentrate on acquiring teachers who really care about children and are willing to give their best to help children achieve the best of which they are capable.*

*The education of a child is the total of all his experiences in school and cannot be measured by any tests...The millions of things teachers do for students throughout their lives, likewise, cannot be reduced to a few pencil marks kept well inside the circles and colored in triplicate. Reform: Concentrate on people not tests.*

*I am afraid too much is pushed too fast. I do not think children are grasping the concepts before they are expected to know the results. It may be enough to get past a test, but what about the future where it really counts? Ideas can be very good, but reality must be acknowledged...We do not need to worry that our children be like others, but be concerned that they should feel success in becoming the best they are capable of.*

**7. Administrators, policy makers, and teacher educators need to be more aware of the day to day aspects of teaching.** Teachers feel that increased awareness will result in improved decisions.

> *Too many state and local administrators have had little or no classroom experience. I strongly believe that persons who have not had classroom experience cannot intelligently supervise teachers. Veteran teachers are insulted to be required to meet criteria (set by so-called "experts") which are based on theory rather than practice.*
>
> *I would like to see all college teachers of education, principals, and superintendents have to return to the classroom to teach for a year every four years. I feel it is very important for a classroom teacher to keep current in his/her field, and most important that anyone who tries to teach others to teach experience the classroom situation often.*
>
> *I truly believe that our state sentators and Mr. Joe Frank Harris need to pay visits to our rural schools and see why teachers and schools in these particular areas need more pay and funding.*

**8. An increased responsibility should be assumed by teacher education institutions relative to their graduates' readiness to teach.** A reciprocal of this suggestion may be a reduction in evaluative certification requirements for first year teachers.

> *College programs should be strong enough to decide whether persons are capable of teaching -- rather than giving them a degree <u>then</u> having them "defeated" in the field.*
>
> *Education courses do not meet the needs of new teachers. It seems that courses which have absolutely nothing to do with the teacher in the class, either in method or content, can stop a teacher from being certified.*
>
> *I feel that the education system would improve if requirements to become certified (in the colleges) became more rigorous.*

*I feel that it is the university's/college's responsibility for making sure that someone is qualified to teach. All of the procedures that one must go through after graduation should be a part of undergraduate requirements for graduation.*

**9. Efforts to modify and simplify state mandated certification and evaluation requirements, especially for first year teachers,should be continued.** Teachers' comments related to current certification and evaluation requirements were not very positive.

*I think that we could do away with the TPAI program. This program is a waste of time and money.*

*I love to teach!! But all the paperwork and knitpicky checklists for observations are driving me away. My teaching encompasses much more than that observed in brief visits. My teaching should be evaluated in a much broader sense than a 5 to 7 point list. I have passed the TPAI twice, 2 sections of the TCT, and have earned a Masters degree (4.0 average). What else do I need to prove my competence!!..I don't mind constructive criticism from a person qualified in my field, but this evaluation program is not that.*

*Certification should be based on completion of an appropriate four-year college program. The GTOI should replace the TPAI, and under no circumstances should first year teachers undergo such high-pressure evaluations as those involved in the TPAI.*

*It took the state 6 full months to contact me and let me know what I need to get a Georgia certificate. Then they give me only 6 months to meet certain requirements or I lose my job. I am in a state that needs many teachers; just waiting to teach and willing, and I get the door slammed in my face. If you are trying to recruit teachers to Georgia , find a new way. A FAIR WAY!!*

**10. We need to recognize the growing frustration among teachers in southeast Georgia and realize that these frustrations diminish our ability to attract and retain quality professional people.** Everyone does some complaining about his or her job. The comments included on these surveys,

however, moved beyond general griping. These individuals seem to be very discouraged.

*Sometimes I feel as though the state thinks we are a lot of "dummies" without any idea of what our job is. I feel very insulted and discouraged about the teaching profession. I know I will never make retirement.*

*If a teacher is independently wealthy, philanthropically inclined, and has a means of prolonging the school day to do all QBE and the public demand (perhaps 2 hours longer each day), and meet the needs of the students (perhaps 10 hours more per day), then perhaps teaching would once again become spiritually "rewarding". However, under present conditions, serving as scapegoats for a society turned in upon itself, serving with no pay increases (but with limitless demands), and with little to no respect for our work from society itself; choosing education as a profession is lowered in priority. To esteem education is to esteem its children and, thus, their caretakers. Support--monetarily, socially, politically, humanistically -- is needed.*

*It is very discouraging to be a new teacher in the state of Georgia; I feel I need to be wonderwoman to survive.*

*Teachers are generally discouraged by the seeming apathy on the part of students and parents...Younger teachers are considering leaving the profession, older teachers no longer care and those of us nearing retirement and needing to achieve that for financial reasons feel we have no options except to "tough it out". We need some answers to the education dilemma.*

*The state has done everything to drive me away from teaching!!*

*Teachers are so overworked and under-appreciated it gets down right discouraging. All these new programs mean paperwork for us and we can barely keep our heads above the "piles"...So many students have emotional problems and learning problems that there's no way one teacher with 27-33 kids can meet their educational*

*needs. Reduce class size! Cut through the documentation baloney and let us do what we enjoy doing! We can reduce drop-out and failure rate and increase enjoyment of learning if the whole system were rearranged. Let teachers make administrative decisions. Give us more planning time and you'll see the results.*

## Closing Remarks

From the 5,696 pages of information included in the 1,424 survey instruments, several areas of critical concern surfaced. The comments that follow are simply researcher impressions.

Teachers who participated in this study seemed to have messages on opposing ends of an evaluative continuum. Significant interest in the profession and in changing the profession was evident. This interest is a critical feature in generating positive elements relative to teaching. However, expectancies of teachers by society and decision-makers have escalated with so little in return. A nurturing of teachers will enhance the nurturing by teachers. Evidence of this cycle's completion will be recognized in the ultimate end product, the students.

Nurturing; what are the nutrients expected by teachers? An initial nutrient is preparation of teachers. Teacher educators must become better informed about realities in the classroom. Colleges must regain the confidence of public educators and state policy makers. This may be done by delivering a product that is well prepared for the task at hand.

Decision-making as a nutrient is at the apex. Two aspects of decision-making seem to be important. First, teachers want increased latitude in classroom-related decisions. Second, a point of extreme interest is that other decision and policy developers be very informed about classroom practices. What, then, constitutes informed decision-makers? A position of educational policy maker does not necessarily positively coincide with the concept of being informed. Teachers expressed confidence in decision-makers who: epitomize professionalism in their own role; and, are knowledgeable about current classroom expectancies and practices.

Nurturing can also be achieved in the area of working conditions. Statistical data reflect that these conditions are perceived as discouraging by nearly one-half

(48.2%) of the respondents, especially those in communities with a population of greater than 20,000. Teachers' references to working conditions were rarely associated with the physical structure in which they toil. Rather, their interest was in the work process. Perhaps excessive paperwork and other non-instructional duties are a necessity. If these tasks are significant, alternatives for completion assistance (such as the employment of additional non-teaching personnel) need to be considered and implemented.

Parents are also a part of the nurturing process. Teachers, however, view parental support as very discouraging. In fact, according to survey results, parental support was rated second only to salary as a discouraging factor. Some parents, of course, recognize their right and responsibility to be participants in the education of their children. But what of others who fail to recognize or choose to be an integral part of their children's education? Their failure is not a singular responsibility. Schools become a part of these parents' decision not to participate. Some schools, however, have carefully defined plans for parental involvement. For elementary and middle grade schools, parental involvement is particularly important. Flexible scheduling, home visits, and administrative intervention have very positively contributed to parental involvement. As educators, we can't refer to "them". If "they" are a vital entity, then "they" become "we". Too often, limits of teaching are associated with a lack of parental support. This lack of support, though, becomes an ultimatum that we effectively reach and serve those particular students. As in many respects, society depends on it. How can the impossible be achieved? Teachers are the source; let's consult them.

Yes, salary is also a feature of nurturing. The need is readily identified as teachers rated salary the most discouraging of factors. Teachers recognize efforts that have resulted in improvement. They maintain, too, that improvements currently reside in developmental stages. Differentiated staffing with salary differentials must move from the horizon to the classroom. Capping yearly increases at 17 years of experience must surely be addressed. For many teachers at this level, instructional performance is elevating. Is it justified, then, to have salary plateauing?

Performance-based certification requirements are nurturing potentials. Implementation of these evaluative measures have generated numerous teacher questions. These questions have not gone unheeded by policy makers. Evidence clearly exists that carefully measured responses have been offered. Survey responses stimulated a yet-to-be-answered question though: is the need for accountability the same for all teachers?

Georgia's Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) is recognized as a powerful idea with an indisputable intent. In reality, however, implementation has caused teachers to question its effectiveness. Commodities have a price. The absence of full purchase power results in an inability to secure the commodity. At this point, teachers don't know the value of QBE because the funding price hasn't been paid. On the other hand, the price of fragmented implementation has been dearly paid by many teachers.

Teachers have many questions and concerns, along with a wealth of potential. Meaningful interaction by policy makers with informed teachers offers the next giant stride in improving education for Georgians.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

**INSTRUMENT**

***"Perceptions of Teaching and Educational Reform"***

# PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Directions

Please circle the appropriate response(s) for each item.

1. The population of the community in which your school is located:

   a. Less than 10,000 b. 10,000-20,000 c. 20,001-50,000
   d. 50,001-100,000 e. more than 100,000

2. The student enrollment of your school:

   a. less than 300 b. 300-750 c. 751-1200 d. 1201-1650
   e. more than 1650

3. Grade levels in the organizational structure of your school:

   K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. Grade level(s) for which you have instructional responsibility:

   K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

5. For how many subject preparations are you responsible on most days?

   1 2 3 4 5 or more

6. The highest academic degree you have attained:

   a. baccalaureate b. masters c. specialist (sixth year)
   d. doctorate

7. As an undergraduate student, did you earn a degree in education?

   a. Yes b. No

8. For which grade levels are you certified?

   a. K-4 c. 7-12 (specify field _____)
   b. 4-8 d. K-12 (specify field _____)

9. Your approximate undergraduate grade point average on a four point scale:

   a. 2.0-2.49 b. 2.5-2.99 c. 3.0-3.49 d. 3.5-3.99 e. 4.0

10. The most influential person in your decision to teach:

    a. family member d. high school teacher g. friend
    b. elementary teacher e. high school principal h. other (please
    c. elementary principal f. school counselor specify)
    _____

11. The relationship of each immediate family member who served or serves in the field of education:

    a. brother  c. father  e. sister  g. spouse
    b. daughter  d. mother  f. son  h. no relations

12. The age at which you initially developed an interest in teaching:

    a. younger than 12  b. 12-15  c. 16-18  d. 19-21
    e. 22-25  f. older than 25

13. Your current age:

    a. 21-30  b. 31-40  c. 41-50  d. 51-60  e. 61-70
    f. older than 70

14. Your sex:

    a. male  b. female

15. Your race:

    a. Black  b. White  c. Hispanic
    d. Other (please specify) _____

16. The number of years you have been teaching:

    a. 0-5  b. 6-10  c. 11-15  d. 16-20  e. more than 20

# PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING AS A CAREER OPPORTUNITY

A. The following items represent various factors of teaching. Please rate each factor as you regard its relative degree of encouragement for those considering teaching as a career opportunity. Place the appropriate letter(s) in the space to the left of each number.

Ratings: VE - very encouraging; E - encouraging; D - discouraging; VD - very discouraging

_____1. certification requirements
_____2. contributions to humanity
_____3. fringe benefits
_____4. job availability
_____5. job security
_____6. parental support
_____7. salary
_____8. social status
_____9. student cooperation
____10. working conditions

B. Enjoyment of teaching (circle the appropriate response)

1. I enjoy teaching:
   a. all of the time b. most of the time c. some of the time
   d. not very much of the time e. not at all

2. Most teachers enjoy teaching:
   a. all of the time b. most of the time c. some of the time
   d. not very much of the time e. not at all

C. Teacher candidates (circle the appropriate response)

1. Teaching is a good career for females:
   a. yes b. possibly c. doubtfully d. no

2. Teaching is a good career for males:
   a. yes b. possibly c. doubtfully d. no

3. I would encourage an interested daughter to pursue teaching:
   a. yes b. possibly c. doubtfully d. no

4. I would encourage an interested son to pursue teaching:
   a. yes b. possibly c. doubtfully d. no

D. Your career choice (circle the appropriate response)

1. If you could start all over again, would you choose teaching as a career?
   a. yes b. possibly c. doubtfully d. no

# EDUCATIONAL REFORM CONSIDERATIONS

Directions

The following items represent reforms that have been proposed by various interest groups. Please rate your reaction for each proposal by placing the appropriate letter(s) in the space to the left of each number.

Ratings: SA - strongly agree; A - agree; D - disagree; SD - strongly disagree

____ 1. abolition of undergraduate major in education
____ 2. career ladders with differentiated salaries in relationship to accomplishments
____ 3. certification based on classroom performance
____ 4. differentiated staffing; certified teachers assisted by interns, instructors, paraprofessionals, etc.
____ 5. higher teacher salaries
____ 6. increased academic curriculum in high schools
____ 7. less emphasis on athletics and other extracurricular activities
____ 8. longer school days
____ 9. longer school years
____10. mentor teachers to assist and supervise beginning teachers
____11. more federal funding for educational programs
____12. more state funding for educational programs
____13. national board certification process
____14. partnerships between colleges/universities and community schools
____15. public education for four year olds
____16. requirement for students to do homework
____17. requirement of five years for collegiate teacher training
____18. restriction of teachers to instructing only in their subject matter major
____19. standardized testing of teachers as a basis for teacher credentializing and licensing
____20. standardized testing of students at every grade level
____21. standardized test scores to determine student promotion
____22. state-wide standardization of curriculum

If you so desire, provide comments related to the teaching profession and educational reform.

# APPENDIX B

**Tables**

**Table 1**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SOUTHEAST GEORGIA TEACHERS**

| | Variable | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Population of community in which school is located: | |
| | a. less than 10,000 | 35.5 |
| | b. 10,000 to 20,000 | 30.3 |
| | c. 20,001 to 50,000 | 15.5 |
| | d. 50,001 to 100,000 | 7.7 |
| | e. more than 100,000 | 10.9 |
| 2. | Student enrollment of school: | |
| | a. less than 300 | 1.9 |
| | b. 300 to 750 | 38.6 |
| | c. 751 to 1200 | 50.7 |
| | d. 1201 to 1650 | 8.8 |
| 3. | Organizational structure of school: | |
| | a. elementary grades | 48.2 |
| | b. middle grades/junior high | 22.1 |
| | c. high school | 26.7 |
| | d. combination | 3.0 |
| 4. | Grade level(s) taught: | |
| | a. elementary | 47.8 |
| | b. middle grades/junior high | 22.5 |
| | c. high school | 27.6 |
| | d. combination | 2.0 |
| 5. | Number of preparations per day: | |
| | a. one | 10.9 |
| | b. two | 17.6 |
| | c. three | 14.9 |
| | d. four | 11.7 |
| | e. five or more | 44.8 |

**Table 1 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Highest degree attained: | | |
| | a. | baccalaureate | 53.9 |
| | b. | masters | 36.6 |
| | c. | specialist | 9.1 |
| | d. | doctorate | .4 |
| 7. | Bachelors in Education | | |
| | a. | yes | 84.3 |
| | b. | no | 15.7 |
| 8. | Type of Certification | | |
| | a. | K-4 | 20.5 |
| | b. | 4-8 | 12.7 |
| | c. | 1-8 or (K-4 and 4-8) | 18.2 |
| | d. | 7-12 | 24.4 |
| | e. | K-12 | 15.7 |
| | f. | Dual | 8.5 |
| 9. | Field of Certification | | |
| | a. | art | 1.2 |
| | b. | business | 2.0 |
| | c. | early childhood (K-4) | 22.4 |
| | d. | elementary (1-8) | 18.7 |
| | e. | English | 6.3 |
| | f. | foreign language | .8 |
| | g. | health and physical education | 4.6 |
| | h. | home economics | 1.1 |
| | i. | vocational | 2.0 |
| | j. | reading | 1.1 |
| | k. | math | 3.9 |
| | l. | music | 1.8 |
| | m. | science | 3.8 |
| | n. | social science | 6.9 |
| | o. | special education | 6.9 |
| | p. | middle grades | 14.7 |
| | q. | media/guidance | 1.7 |

**Table 1 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Undergraduate grade point average: | | |
| | a. | 2.0 to 2.49 | 2.1 |
| | b. | 2.5 to 2.99 | 20.4 |
| | c. | 3.0 to 3.49 | 44.5 |
| | d. | 3.5 to 3.99 | 31.7 |
| | e. | 4.0 | 1.3 |
| 11. | Most influential person in decision to teach: | | |
| | a. | family member | 36.5 |
| | b. | elementary teacher | 16.2 |
| | c. | elementary principal | .9 |
| | d. | high school teacher | 22.9 |
| | e. | high school principal | 1.4 |
| | f. | school counselor | 1.6 |
| | g. | friend | 9.7 |
| | h. | other | 10.8 |
| 12. | Family members serving in field of education: | | |
| | a. | brother | 8.2 |
| | b. | daughter | 3.3 |
| | c. | father | 7.0 |
| | d. | mother | 18.9 |
| | e. | sister | 22.7 |
| | f. | son | 1.5 |
| | g. | spouse | 15.9 |
| | h. | none | 47.8 |
| 13. | Age at which individual initially developed an interest in teaching: | | |
| | a. | younger than 12 | 19.8 |
| | b. | 12-15 | 15.6 |
| | c. | 16-18 | 25.9 |
| | d. | 19-21 | 22.7 |
| | e. | 22-25 | 8.2 |
| | f. | older than 25 | 7.8 |

**Table 1 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Current age: | | |
| | a. | 21-30 | 22.4 |
| | b. | 31-40 | 37.6 |
| | c. | 41-50 | 28.0 |
| | d. | 51-60 | 11.1 |
| | e. | 61-70 | .8 |
| 15. | Sex: | | |
| | a. | female | 84.4 |
| | b. | male | 15.6 |
| 16. | Race: | | |
| | a. | black | 20.1 |
| | b. | other | .6 |
| | c. | white | 79.4 |
| 17. | Years Experience | | |
| | a. | 0-5 | 24.8 |
| | b. | 6-10 | 18.9 |
| | c. | 11-15 | 21.6 |
| | d. | 16-20 | 18.5 |
| | e. | >20 | 16.2 |

**Table 2**

**DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS CLASSIFICATION RESULTS USING BACKGROUND VARIABLES**

| Discriminant Groups | Predicted Group Membership | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Y | P | D | N |
| Yes (24%) | 48.5% | 14.1% | 18.9% | 18.6% |
| Possibly (34%) | 30.7% | 21.9% | 23.4% | 24.1% |
| Doubtfully (21%) | 27.8% | 10.4% | 35.1% | 26.6% |
| No (21%) | 17.7% | 15.7% | 24.5% | 42.2% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 35%

| Discriminant Group | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|
| | Would choose again | Would not choose again |
| Would choose teaching again (58%) | 57.7% | 42.3% |
| Would not choose teaching again (42%) | 38.6 | 61.4% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 59.26%

**Table 3**

**BACKGROUND VARIABLES WHICH INDEPENDENTLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THOSE WHO WOULD AND WOULD NOT CHOOSE TEACHING AGAIN**

| Variable | Level of Significance |
|---|---|
| Organization of School | .0216 |
| Grades Taught | .0106 |
| Number of Preparations | .0214 |
| Degree Held | .0436 |
| Field of Certification | .0006 |
| Age First Interested | .0003 |
| Current Age | .0025 |
| Sex | .0337 |
| Years Experience | .0000 |

**Table 4**

## PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING AS A CAREER OPPORTUNITY

| Variables | Percentages | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Encouraging | Encouraging | Discouraging | Very Discouraging |
| **A. Factors in teaching** | | | | |
| 1. certification requirements | 7.9 | 35.7 | 42.9 | 13.5 |
| 2. contribution to humanity | 40.1 | 49.8 | 8.6 | 1.6 |
| 3. fringe benefits | 6.5 | 41.3 | 33.6 | 18.5 |
| 4. job availability | 14.2 | 68.4 | 16.0 | 1.3 |
| 5. job security | 15.9 | 66.6 | 14.7 | 2.8 |
| 6. parental support | 4.1 | 23.1 | 41.9 | 30.9 |
| 7. salary | 1.8 | 14.1 | 42.9 | 41.2 |
| 8. social status | 2.6 | 38.8 | 40.0 | 18.7 |
| 9. student cooperation | 2.3 | 26.7 | 48.0 | 22.9 |
| 10. working conditions | 6.5 | 45.3 | 36.0 | 12.2 |
| | All of the time | Most of the time | Some of the time | Not very much | Not at all |
| **B. Enjoyment of teaching** | | | | | |
| 1. I enjoy teaching: | 12.3 | 69.9 | 15.2 | 2.3 | .2 |
| 2. Most teachers enjoy teaching: | 1.3 | 53.9 | 39.7 | 4.9 | .1 |
| | Yes | Possibly | Doubtfully | No |
| **C. Teacher candidates** | | | | |
| 1. Teaching is a good career for females | 51.8 | 38.6 | 6.2 | 3.4 |
| 2. Teaching is a good career for males | 26.8 | 37.9 | 20.0 | 15.4 |
| 3. I would encourage an interested daughter to pursue teaching | 24.4 | 29.0 | 16.7 | 29.9 |
| 4. I would encourage an interested son to pursue teaching | 14.8 | 22.2 | 19.1 | 43.9 |

**Table 4 continued**

| | Yes | Possibly | Doubtfully | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **D. Your career choice** | | | | |
| If you could start all over again, would you choose teaching as a career | 23.7 | 33.0 | 22.0 | 21.4 |

**Table 5**

**SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING BETWEEN GROUPS CATEGORIZED ON BASIS OF BACKGROUND VARIABLES**

| Community Population | ratio | prob. | *direction of significance (in thousands) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fringe benefits | 2.48 | .0420 | 10to20, <10, 50to100, >100, 20to50 |
| Job security | 2.55 | .0375 | 10to20+, <10-, >100, 50to100, 20to50 |
| Social status | 7.19 | .0000 | 10to20+, <10+, 20to50-, 50to100-, >100- |
| Working conditions | 9.38 | .0000 | 10to20+, <10-, 50to100-, 20to50-, >100- |
| | | | 10to20+, <10+, 50to100, 20to50-, >100- |
| I enjoy teaching | 2.55 | .0379 | 10to20, <10, >100, 50to100, 20to50 |
| Most enjoy teaching | 6.26 | .0001 | 10to20+, >100, <10-, 20to50-, 50to100- |
| Good career for females | 7.78 | .0000 | 10to20+, <10-, 50to100-, 20to50-, >100- |
| Good career for males | 3.60 | .0062 | 10to20+, >100, <10-, 20to50, 50to100 |
| Would encourage daughter | 5.39 | .0003 | 10to20+, 50to100, <10-, 20to50-, >100- |
| Would encourage son | 2.80 | .0247 | 10to20+, <10-, 50to100, >100, 20to50- |
| I would choose again | 5.00 | .0005 | 10to20+, <10-, >100-, 20to50-, 50to100- |

| Student Enrollment | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 3.40 | .0173 | 300to750+, 751to1200+, 1201to1650-, <300 |
| Salary | 5.61 | .0008 | 300to750+, 751to1200-, 1201to1650-, <300 |
| Social status | 3.51 | .0242 | 300to750+, 751to1200+, <300, 1201to1650- |
| Most enjoy teaching | 6.78 | .0002 | 300to750+, 751to1200+, <300, 1201to1650- |

| Type of School | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 3.09 | .0262 | Middle+, Elem.+, H.S.-, Comb.- |
| Job security | 3.60 | .0131 | Middle+, H.S.+, Elem.+, Comb.- |
| Social status | 3.31 | .0196 | Elem.+, H.S.-, Middle-, Comb.- |
| Student cooperation | 3.10 | .0260 | Elem.+, H.S.+, Comb., Middle- |
| Good career for males | 7.37 | .0000 | H.S.+, Middle-, Elem.-, Comb.- |
| Would encourage son | 3.73 | .0109 | H.S.+, Middle, Elem.-, Comb.- |
| I would choose again | 3.72 | .0007 | Elem.+, H.S.-, Middle-, Comb.- |

*Groups are identified from most positive to least positive.

Plus (+) and minus (-) indicate a .05 level of significance between groups using the Scheffe test.

**Table 5 Continued**

| Grade Level Taught | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 3.23 | .0218 | Elem.+, Middle, H.S.-, Comb.- |
| Social status | 4.99 | .0019 | Elem.+, H.S.-, Middle-, Comb.- |
| Student cooperation | 4.52 | .0037 | Elem.+, H.S.+, Comb., Middle- |
| Good career for females | 2.96 | .0313 | Elem., H.S., Middle, Comb. |
| Good career for males | 5.66 | .0007 | H.S.+, Middle-, Elem.-, Comb.- |
| Would encourage son | 2.95 | .0316 | H.S., Middle, Elem., Comb. |
| I would choose again | 6.30 | .0003 | Elem.+, Comb., H.S.-, Middle- |

| Daily Preparations | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social status | 4.72 | .0009 | 4+, >4+, 1, 3-, 2- |
| | | | 4+, >4+, 1+, 3, 2- |
| Most enjoy teaching | 3.80 | .0045 | >4+, 1, 4, 2-, 3- |
| I would choose again | 4.37 | .0016 | >4+, 4, 1, 2-, 3- |

| Highest Degree | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 3.58 | .0134 | Bach.+, Mast.+, Spec.-, Doct. |
| Fringe benefits | 2.61 | .0500 | Bach.+, Doct., Mast.-, Spec. |
| Social status | 5.41 | .0011 | Bach.+, Mast.-, Spec.-, Doct. |
| Student cooperation | 3.25 | .0212 | Doct., Bach.+, Spec., Mast.- |
| Working conditions | 5.58 | .0008 | Bach.+, Mast.+, Spec.-, Doct. |
| I enjoy teaching | 5.87 | .0006 | Doct., Bach.+, Spec., Mast.- |
| Most enjoy teaching | 8.26 | .0000 | Doct., Bach.+, Mast.-, Spec.- |
| Good career for females | 6.76 | .0002 | Bach.+, Spec.-, Mast.-, Doct. |
| Good career for males | 4.82 | .0024 | Doct., Bach.+, Spec., Mast.- |
| Would encourage daughter | .62 | .0000 | Doct., Bach+, Spec., Mast.- |
| Would encourage son | 10.04 | .0000 | Doct., Bach.+, Spec., Mast.- |
| I would choose again | 7.32 | .0001 | Bach.+, Spec., Mast.-, Doct. |

| Bachelors in Education | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Contributions to humanity | 4.10 | .0431 | No+, Yes- |
| Student cooperation | 7.66 | .0057 | Yes+, No- |
| Working conditions | 4.33 | .0376 | Yes+, No- |
| Good career for males | 6.42 | .0114 | No, Yes |
| Would encourage son | 7.17 | .0075 | No+, Yes- |

**Table 5 continued**

| Level of Certification | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 4.58 | .0004 | Kto4+, 1to8, 4to8, Kto12, Dual-, 7to12- |
| | | | Kto4+, 1to8+, 4to8, Kto12, Dual, 7to12- |
| Student cooperation | 6.17 | .0000 | Kto4+, Dual+, Kto12, 7to12, 1to8-, 4to8- |
| | | | Kto4+, Dual+, Kto12, 7to12, 1to8-, 4to8- |
| Would encourage daughter | 3.10 | .0088 | Kto4+, Dual, Kto12, 1to8, 7to12-, 4to8- |
| Would encourage son | 2.89 | .0132 | Kto12+, Dual, 7to12, Kto4, 1to8, 4to8- |
| I would choose again | 6.02 | .0000 | Kto4+, Kto12-, 1to8, 7to12-, Dual-, 4to8- |

| Field of Certification | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 2.01 | .0101 | L,K,N,A,B,J,D,C,O,G,Q,P,E,F,H,M,I |
| Fringe benefits | 1.91 | .0163 | N,K,L,E,J,M,P,A,Q,D,O,H,B,C,F,G,I |
| Job availibility | 2.02 | .0099 | N,M,G,P+,D+,F,A+,Q,E,B,C,H,I,K,L,J,O- |
| Social status | 2.11 | .0062 | K,N,L,J,A,M,O,B,Q,P,D,C,F,E,H,G,I |
| Student cooperation | 3.80 | .0000 | N,I,Q,K,O,A+,P,H,E,G,B,L,M,J,D-,F-,C |
| | | | N,I,Q,K,O+,A+,P+,H,E,G,B+,L,M,J,D-,F,C |
| Working conditions | 2.10 | .0067 | L+,N,J,K,Q,G,A,I,O,B,D,P,E,C,H,M,F- |
| Most enjoy teaching | 2.26 | .0030 | K,L,G,M,Q,O,B+,P,A+,N,E,D,C,J,H,I,F- |
| Would encourage daughter | 1.94 | .0141 | L,N,J,K,C,A+,Q,G,I,M,O,P,F,H,E,D-,B- |
| I would choose again | 2.68 | .0003 | N,C,A+,K,L,J,B,P,O,I,F,G,E,M,D-,Q,H- |

KEY:

A = Early Childhood
B = Elementary
C = Middle Grades
D = Reading
E = English
F = Math
G = Science
H = Social Studies
I = Art
J = Music
K = Business
L = Home Economics
M = Vocational
N = Foreign Language
O = Health & PE
P = Special Ed.
Q = Media/Guidance

**Table 5 continued**

| Grade Point Average | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 2.47 | .0433 | 2.0-2.49, 4.0, 3.0-3.49, 3.5-3.99, 2.5-2.99 |
| Working conditions | 2.57 | .0364 | 2.0-2.49, 4.0, 3.0-3.49+, 2.5-2.99, 3.5-3.99- |

| Most Influential Person | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parental support | 3.17 | .0025 | SC, FM+, HT, ET-, HP, EP, O-, F- |
| Student cooperation | 3.75 | .0005 | FM+, HT, HP, SC, ET-, EP, F-, O- |
| I would choose again | 2.38 | .0201 | EP, ET+, HT, SC, FM, O-, F-, HP |

KEY:
F = Family Member
ET = Elementary Teacher
EP = Elementary Principal
HT = High School Teacher
HP = High School Principal
SC = School Counselor
FR = Friend
O = Other

| Family Member in Education | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parental support | 6.14 | .0134 | Yes+, No- |
| Student cooperation | 5.72 | .0169 | Yes+, No- |
| Good career for males | 4.38 | .0366 | Yes+, No- |
| Would encourage daughter | 14.10 | .0002 | Yes+, No- |
| Would encourage son | 7.41 | .0066 | Yes+, No- |

| Age First Interested | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Contributions to humanity | 3.43 | .0044 | <12+, 12to15, 19to21, >25, 16to18-,22to25- |
| | | | 12+, 12to15+, 19to21, >25, 16to18, 22to25 |
| Student cooperation | 3.63 | .0029 | 12to15+,<12+,>25+,19to21,16to18+,>22to25- |
| I enjoy teaching | 5.64 | .0000 | 12to15+,>25+,16to18+, <12+,19to21-,22to25- |
| Good career for females | 4.78 | .0002 | 12to15+, 16to18-, <12, 22to25, 19to21-, >25- |
| | | | 12to15+,16to18+,<12+,22to25+,19to21+,>25- |
| Would encourage daughter | 5.02 | .0001 | 12to15+, <12+, >25, 22to25, 16to18-, 19to21- |
| I would choose again | 8.60 | .0000 | 12to15+, <12+, >25, 16to18-, 19to21-,22to25- |
| | | | 12to15+,<12+,>25+, 16to18+, 19to21-, 22to25 |

**Table 5 continued**

| Current Age | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 2.41 | .0474 | 61to70, 51to60+, 41to50, 21to30, 31to40- |
| Contributions to humanity | 2.71 | .0288 | 61to70, 21to30+, 51to60, 41to50, 31to40- |
| Fringe benefits | 5.52 | .0002 | 21to30+, 31to40-, 61to70, 51to60-, 41to50- |
| Job security | 12.76 | .0000 | 21to30+, 31to40-, 41to50-, 51to60-, 61to70 |
| | | | 21to30+, 31to40+, 41to50, 51to60-, 61to70 |
| Parental support | 2.47 | .0433 | 41to50, 51to60, 21to30, 31to40, 61to70 |
| Salary | 2.90 | .0211 | 61to70, 51to60+, 41to50+, 21to30, 31to40- |
| I enjoy teaching | 2.97 | .0187 | 61to70, 51to60+, 21to30-, 41to50-, 31to40- |
| Good career for females | 6.59 | .0000 | 21to30+, 31to40-, 51to60-, 41to50-, 61to70 |
| Good career for males | 5.84 | .0001 | 21to30+, 61to70, 31to40-, 41to50-, 51to60- |
| Would encourage daughter | 9.75 | .0000 | 21to30+, 61to70, 51to60-, 41to50-, 31to40- |
| Would encourage son | 9.59 | .0000 | 21to30+, 61to70, 51to60-, 31to40-, 41to50- |
| I would choose again | 5.44 | .0002 | 21to30+, 51to60-, 31to40-, 41to50-, 61to70 |

| Sex | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 4.57 | .0327 | Female+, Male- |
| Good career for males | 15.72 | .0001 | Male+, Female- |
| Would encourage son | 18.32 | .0000 | Male+, Female- |
| I would choose again | 8.98 | .0028 | Female+, Male- |

| Race | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 23.29 | .0000 | Black+, Other, White- |
| Contributions to humanity | 5.34 | .0049 | Black+, White-, Other |
| Job security | 14.15 | .0000 | White+, Black-, Other- |
| Parental support | 10.25 | .0000 | Black+, White-, Other |
| Salary | .39 | .0017 | Other, Black+, White- |
| Social status | 22.14 | .0000 | Black+, Other, White- |
| Student cooperation | 15.14 | .0000 | Other, Black+, White- |
| Working conditions | 11.09 | .0000 | Black+, White, Other |
| I enjoy teaching | 4.27 | .0141 | Black+, White-, Other |
| Most enjoy teaching | 13.55 | .0000 | Black+, Other, White- |
| Good career for females | 8.26 | .0003 | Black+, White+, Other- |
| Good career for males | 18.15 | .0000 | Black+, White-, Other |
| Would encourage daughter | 4.00 | .0184 | White+, Black-, Other |
| I would choose again | 5.21 | .0055 | White+, Black-, Other |

**Table 5 continued**

| Years Experience | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Certification requirements | 5.27 | .0003 | >20+, 6to10-, 16to20-, 11to15-, 0to5- |
| Fringe benefits | 9.39 | .0000 | 0to5+, 6to10, >20-, 11to15-, 16to20- |
| | | | 0to5+, 6to10+, >20, 11to15-, 16to20- |
| | | | 0to5+, 6to10+, >20+, 11to15, 16to20- |
| Job security | 11.12 | .0000 | 0to5+, 6to10+, 11to15-, 16to20-, >20- |
| Parental support | | | 0to5+, 6to10+, 11to15+, 16to20, .20- |
| Salary | 4.16 | .0024 | >20+, 16to20, 0to5, 6to10-, 11to15- |
| Social status | 2.57 | .0366 | >20, 0to5, 16to20, 6to10, 11to15 |
| Good career for females | 5.70 | .0002 | 0to5+, >20-, 11to15-, 6to10-, 16to20- |
| Good career for males | 8.60 | .0000 | 0to5+, >20-, 6to10-, 16to20-, 11to15- |
| Would encourage daughter | 16.17 | .0000 | 0to5+, 6to10-, >20-, 11to15-, 16to20- |
| | | | 0to5+, 6to10+, >20, 11to15-, 16to20 |
| Would encourage son | 15.10 | .0000 | 0to5+, >20-, 6to10-, 16to20-, 11to15- |
| I would choose again | 11.29 | .0000 | 0to5+, 6to10-, 16to20-, >20-, 11to15- |
| | | | 0to5+, 6to10+, 16to20-, >20-, 11to15- |

**Table 6**

**DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS CLASSIFICATION RESULTS USING PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING**

| Discriminant Group | Predicted Group Membership | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Y | P | D | N |
| Yes (24%) | 69.6% | 21.3% | 5.2% | 4.0% |
| Possibly (33%) | 28.9% | 42.6% | 18.4% | 10.1% |
| Doubtfully (22%) | 8.6% | 23.8% | 30.4% | 37.3% |
| No (21%) | 5.1% | 7.5% | 21.5% | 65.9% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 51%

| Discriminant Groups | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|
| | Would choose again | Would not choose again |
| Would choose teaching again (57%) | 79.9% | 20.1% |
| Would not choose teaching again (43%) | 22.1% | 77.9% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 78%

**Table 7**

**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING WHICH INDEPENDENTLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THOSE WHO WOULD AND WOULD NOT CHOOSE TEACHING AGAIN**

| Variable | Level of Significance |
|---|---|
| Certification Requirements | .0273 |
| Contribution to Humanity | .0000 |
| Fringe Benefits | .0000 |
| Job Availability | .0000 |
| Job Security | .0000 |
| Parental Support | .0000 |
| Salary | .0000 |
| Social Status | .0000 |
| Student Cooperation | .0000 |
| Working Conditions | .0000 |
| Personal Enjoyment of Teaching | .0000 |
| Perceptions of Others' Enjoyment of Teaching | .0000 |
| Good Career for Females | .0000 |
| Good Career for Males | .0000 |
| Would Encourage Interested Daughter | .0000 |
| Would Encourage Interested Son | .0000 |

**Table 8**

**DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS CLASSIFICATION RESULTS USING BACKGROUND VARIABLES AND PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING**

| Discriminant Groups | Predicted Group Membership | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Y | P | D | N |
| Yes (24%) | 74.4% | 18.6% | 5.3% | 1.8% |
| Possibly (34%) | 27.4% | 44.4% | 19.5% | 8.6% |
| Doubtfully (22%) | 7.9% | 21.7% | 42.3% | 28.1% |
| No (20%) | 4.6% | 5.8% | 22.0% | 67.6% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 56%

| Discriminant Groups | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|
| | Would choose again | Would not choose again |
| Would choose teaching again (58%) | 80.6% | 19.4% |
| Would not choose teaching again (42%) | 21.3% | 78.7% |

Grouped cases correctly classified: 79.8%

**Table 9**

## PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM CONSIDERATIONS

| Reforms | Percentages | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. abolition of undergraduate major in education | 4.8 | 11.4 | 43.4 | 40.3 |
| 2. career ladders with differentiated salaries in relationship to accomplishments | 12.5 | 34.9 | 31.4 | 21.2 |
| 3. certification based on classroom performance | 9.7 | 48.1 | 27.8 | 14.3 |
| 4. differentiated staffing; certified teachers assisted by interns, instructors, paraprofessionals, etc. | 29.7 | 59.1 | 8.5 | 2.7 |
| 5. higher teacher salaries | 90.8 | 8.9 | 0 | .3 |
| 6. increased academic curriculum in high schools | 32.5 | 49.8 | 15.5 | 2.2 |
| 7. less emphasis on athletics and other extracurricular activities | 16.3 | 35.9 | 37.8 | 10.0 |
| 8. longer school days | 1.1 | 3.8 | 38.4 | 56.7 |
| 9. longer school years | 2.1 | 8.4 | 33.7 | 55.9 |
| 10. mentor teachers to assist and supervise beginning teachers | 38.6 | 55.0 | 5.3 | 1.1 |
| 11. more federal funding for educational programs | 48.3 | 36.4 | 11.8 | 3.5 |
| 12. more state funding for educational programs | 56.3 | 40.0 | 2.8 | .9 |
| 13. national board certification process | 13.5 | 40.3 | 34.7 | 11.5 |
| 14. partnerships between colleges/ universities and community schools | 30.2 | 65.8 | 3.6 | .4 |
| 15. public education for four year olds | 7.6 | 20.3 | 40.5 | 31.6 |
| 16. requirement for students to do homework | 25.3 | 47.5 | 21.0 | 6.3 |
| 17. requirement of five years for collegiate teacher training | 6.1 | 20.2 | 51.5 | 22.3 |

**Table 9 continued**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. restriction of teachers to instructing only in their subject matter major | 18.7 | 51.1 | 25.0 | 5.2 |
| 19. standardized testing of teachers as a basis for teacher credentializing and licensing | 6.1 | 33.0 | 32.6 | 28.3 |
| 20. standardized testing of students at every grade level | 5.9 | 26.7 | 40.3 | 27.2 |
| 21. standardized test scores used in determining student promotion | 5.1 | 17.7 | 47.8 | 29.4 |
| 22. state standardization of curriculum | 18.8 | 51.9 | 19.9 | 9.4 |

**Table 10**

**SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF REFORM BETWEEN GROUPS CATEGORIZED ON THE BASIS OF BACKGROUND VARIABLES**

| Community Population | ratio | prob. | *direction of significance(in thousands) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 9.14 | .0000 | 50to100+, >100, 20to50+, 10to20-, <10- |
| | | | 50to100+, >100+, 20to50+, 10to20+, <10- |
| Career ladder | 5.37 | .0003 | 50to100+, >100+, 10to20-, 20to50-, <10- |
| Increased academic curriculum | 3.49 | .0076 | <10+, >100, 50to100, 20to50, 10to20- |
| Longer school days | 4.34 | .0017 | >100+, 50to200-, <10-, 20to50-, 10to20 |
| Longer school years | 4.80 | .0008 | >100+, 50to100, <10-, 20to50, 10to20- |
| | | | >100+, 50to100+, <10, 20to50, 10to20- |
| National board certification | 5.09 | .0004 | >100+, 50to100, <10-, 20to50-, 10to20 |
| Public ed. of four year olds | 7.12 | .0000 | >100+, 20to50-, 50to100-, <10-, 10to20- |
| | | | >100+, 20to50, 50to100, <10, 10to20- |
| Requirement for homework | 3.62 | .0061 | >100+, <10-, 20to50-, 50to100, 10to20- |
| Teach only in subject major | 2.97 | .0193 | >100+, 50to100, 20to50, ,10, 10to20- |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 4.53 | .0012 | >100+, 50to100, 20to50, 10to20-, <10- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 5.45 | .0002 | >100+, 50to100-, <10-, 10to20-, 20to50- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 4.45 | .0014 | >100+, 50to100+, 20to50, <10-, 10to20- |
| State curriculum | 3.37 | .0094 | >100+, 10to20-, <10-, 20to50-, 50to100- |

| Student Enrollment | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 10.42 | .0000 | 1201to1650+, 751to1200-, 300to750-, <300- |
| | | | 1201to1650+, 751to1200, 300to750-, <300 |
| Public ed. of four year olds | 2.99 | .0302 | 1201to1650, 300to750+, 751to1200+, <300- |
| Five years teacher training | 3.70 | .0115 | 1201to1650+, 751to1200-, 300to750-, <300 |
| Teach only in subject major | 4.33 | .0044 | 1201to1650+, 751to1200-, 300to750-, <300 |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 4.49 | .0039 | 1201to1650+, 751to1200+, 300to750-, <300 |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 3.42 | .0167 | 1201to1650, 751to1200+, 300to750-, <300- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 4.28 | .0051 | 1201to1650+, 751to1200+, 300to750-, <300 |
| State curriculum | 3.12 | .0252 | <300, 300to750+, 751to1200+, 1201to1650 |

*Groups are identified from most positive to least positive.

Plus (+) and minus (-) indicate a .05 level of significance between groups using the Scheffe test.

**Table 10 continued**

| Type of School | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 30.55 | .0000 | HS+, Comb, Middle-, Elem- |
| | | | HS+, Comb, Middle+, Elem- |
| Career ladder | 6.53 | .0002 | HS+, Middle, Elem-, Comb- |
| | | | HS+, Middle+, Elem+, Comb- |
| Performance based certification | 3.20 | .0225 | HS+, Middle, Elem-, Comb |
| Higher teacher salaries | 3.21 | .0222 | Middle+, Elem+, HS-, Comb |
| Increased academic curriculum | 4.28 | .0051 | Middle+, Elem+, HS-, Comb |
| Longer school days | 8.93 | .0000 | Middle+, HS+, Elem-, Comb |
| Longer school years | 6.17 | .0004 | HS+, Middle+, Comb, Elem- |
| Mentor teachers | 5.92 | .0005 | Elem+, Middle-, HS-, Comb- |
| | | | Elem+, Middle, HS+, Comb- |
| More federal funding | 2.97 | .0311 | Elem+, Middle, HS-, Comb |
| National board certification | 3.23 | .0217 | Middle+, Elem+, HS+, Comb- |
| College/school partnerships | 4.40 | .0043 | Elem+, Middle+, HS-, Comb |
| Requirement for homework | 3.67 | .0120 | HS+, Middle, Elem-, Comb |
| Five years teacher training | 7.76 | .0000 | HS+, Middle+, Elem-, Comb |
| Teach only in subject major | 8.43 | .0000 | Comb, HS+, Elem-, Middle- |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 11.85 | .0000 | HS+, Middle+, Elem-, Comb- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 5.21 | .0014 | HS+, Middle+, Elem-,Comb |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 9.70 | .0000 | HS+, Middle, Elem-, Comb- |
| | | | HS+, Middle+, Elem-, Comb |

| Grade Level Taught | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 31.18 | .0000 | HS+, Comb, Middle-, Elem- |
| | | | HS+, Comb+, Middle+, Elem- |
| Career ladder | 3.10 | .0260 | HS+, Middle, Elem-,Comb |
| Increased academic curriculum | 4.24 | .0054 | Middle+, Elem+, HS-, Comb |
| Longer school days | 7.52 | .0001 | Middle+, HS+, Comb, Elem- |
| Longer school years | 4.90 | .0022 | HS+, Middle+, Elem-, Comb |
| Mentor teachers | 4.43 | .0041 | Elem+, Middle-, HS-, Comb |
| More federal funding | 2.75 | .0415 | Elem+, Middle, HS-, Comb |
| College/school partnerships | 3.71 | .0112 | Comb, Elem+, Middle-, HS- |
| Requirement for homework | 2.91 | .0335 | HS+, Middle, Comb, Elem- |
| Five years teacher training | 6.90 | .0001 | Middle+, HS+, Elem-, Comb |

**Table 10 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teach only in subject major | 7.02 | .0001 | HS+, Comb, Elem-, Middle- |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 8.35 | .0000 | HS+, Middle+, Elem-, Comb |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 4.15 | .0061 | HS+, Middle, Comb, Elem- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 8.95 | .0000 | HS+, Middle-, Comb, Elem- |
| | | | |
| **Daily Preparations** | **ratio** | **prob.** | **direction of significance** |
| Abolish undergraduate major | 16.03 | .0000 | 3+, 4 , 2-, 1-, >4- |
| | | | 3+, 4+, 2+, 1+, >4- |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 5.49 | .0002 | 3+, >4+, 4+, 2+, 1- |
| Mentor teachers | 2.48 | .0425 | >4, 4, 2, 3, 1 |
| More federal funding | 3.83 | .0042 | >4+, 2, 4, 1, 3- |
| More state funding | 2.78 | .0256 | >4+, 4, 2, 1, 3- |
| College/school partnerships | 2.72 | .0284 | >4+, 4, 2, 1, 3- |
| Five years teacher training | 3.28 | .0109 | 2+, 3, 4, 1, >4- |
| Teach only in subject major | 5.22 | .0004 | 3+, 4+, 2+, >4-, 1- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 4.43 | .0015 | 3+, 4, 1, 2+, >4- |
| | | | |
| **Highest Degree** | **ratio** | **prob.** | **direction of significance** |
| Career ladder | 3.25 | .0211 | Doct, Spec, Bach+, Mast- |
| Increased academic curriculum | 5.73 | .0007 | Bach+, Mast+, Spec-, Doct |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 5.04 | .0018 | Spec, Mast+, Bach-, Doct |
| More federal funding | 6.99 | .0001 | Bach+, Mast-, Spec-, Doct |
| Requirement for homework | 4.17 | .0059 | Bach+, Mast+, Spec-, Doct |
| Five years teacher training | 5.51 | .0009 | Doct, Spec+, Mast-, Bach- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 7.51 | .0001 | Bach+, Mast-, Doct, Spec- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 4.38 | .0051 | Doct, Bach+, Mast-, Spec- |
| | | | |
| **Bachelors In Education** | **ratio** | **prob.** | **direction of significance** |
| Abolish undergraduate major | 77.33 | .0000 | No+, Yes- |
| Longer school days | 6.51 | .0108 | No, Yes |
| Longer school years | 15.46 | .0001 | No, Yes |
| More federal funding | 9.54 | .0021 | Yes, No |
| Stand. testing for teachers | 19.06 | .0000 | No, Yes |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 6.16 | .0132 | No, Yes |

**Table 10 continued**

| Level of Certification | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 13.58 | .0000 | 7to12+, Kto12-, Dual-, 4to8-, 1to8-,Kto4- |
| | | | 7to12+, Kto12+, Dual, 4to8, 1to8-, Kto4- |
| Career ladder | 3.69 | .0025 | 7to12+, Kto12+, Kto4+, Dual, 4to8, 1to8- |
| Performance based certification | 3.51 | .0037 | 7to12+, Kto12-, Dual, Kto4, 4to8+, 1to8- |
| Differentiated staffing | 2.24 | .0480 | Dual, Kto4, 7to12, Kto12, 4to8, 1to8 |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 7.04 | .0000 | Dual+, 7to12+, 1to8+, 4to8+, Kto4+, Kto12- |
| Longer school days | 3.13 | .0081 | 7to12+, Kto12+, 4to8, Dual, 1to8-, Kto4- |
| Longer school years | 2.57 | .0255 | 7to12+, Dual, Kto12, 4to8, 1to8, Kto4- |
| Mentor teachers | 2.83 | .0149 | Dual, Kto4+, Kto12, 1to8-, 7to12-, 4to8 |
| More federal funding | 2.64 | .0218 | Kto4+, Kto12, 4to8, Dual, 1to8, 7to12- |
| National board certification | 2.93 | .0122 | Dual+, Kto12, Kto4, 4to8, 1to8, 7to12- |
| Requirement for homework | 5.83 | .0000 | 1to8+, 7to12+, 4to8+, Kto12+, Dual, Kto4- |
| Teach only in subject area | 3.49 | .0039 | 7to12+, Dual, Kto12-, Kto4-, 4to8-, 1to8- |
| Stand. testing for teachers | 5.59 | .0000 | Dual+, 7to12+, Kto12, Kto4-, 1to8-, 4to8- |
| | | | Dual+, 7to12+, Kto12+, Kto4, 1to8-, 4to8- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 2.67 | .0206 | Kto12+, 7to12+, 1to8+, 4to8, Dual, Kto4- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 3.92 | .0015 | 7to12+, Kto12+, Dual, 1to8, 4to8, Kto4- |
| State curriculum | 2.38 | .0449 | Kto12+, Kto4, Dual, 1to8, 4to8, 7to12- |

| Field of Certification | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 8.97 | .0000 | N,E+,G,M,F,C,I,H-,Q-,J-,D-,O-,P-,B-,K-,A-,L- |
| | | | N,E+,G+,M,F+,C,I,H+,Q,J,D-,O-,P-,B-,K,A-,L |
| | | | N+,E+,G+,M,F+,C,I,H+,Q,J,D,O,P,B-,K,A-,L |
| | | | N+,E+,G+,M+,F+,C,I,H+,Q,J,D,O,P,B,K,A-,L |
| Career ladder | 2.44 | .0012 | J+,F+,E,H,G,P,K,L,A+,M,Q,N,D,I,O,B-,C |
| Performance based certification | 2.77 | .0002 | J+,N,F,H,M,I,L,K,G,P,Q,A,E,D-,B-,O-,C |
| | | | J+,N,F+,H+,M,I,L,K,G,P,Q,A,E,D,B-,O,C |
| Differentiated staffing | 1.82 | .0241 | F,E+,J,P,A,L,M,G,D,Q,B-,O,H,I,K,C,N |
| Higher teacher salaries | 1.73 | .0361 | E,D,I,P,K,M,A+,B,O,Q,F,C,H,N,L,G-,J |
| Increased academic curriculum | 4.34 | .0000 | N+,E+,H+,P+,I,B+,G+,D+,A+,F+,Q,C,O+,J,L,K-,M- |
| | | | N+,E+,H+,P+,I+,B+,G+,D+,A+,F+,Q+,C+,O+,J+,L,K,M- |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 8.01 | .0000 | F+,N+,E+,G+,L+,C+,P+,B+,M+,A+,I+,D+,H+,K+,Q+,J+,O- |
| Longer school days | 1.97 | .0121 | I,K,A,B,E,N,O,L,M,C,F,J,G,H,P,D,Q |
| Longer school years | 2.01 | .0102 | Q,H+,F,G,N,M,K,J,P,I,E,D,B,O,A-,C,L |

**Table 10 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mentor teachers | 2.28 | .0027 | L,C,P,E,A+,I,G,J,Q,D,F,B,M,H,O-,K,N |
| More federal funding | 2.08 | .0074 | P+,A+,J,D,E,N,O,C,B,Q,K,G,F,M,I,H-,L |
| More state funding | 1.96 | .0126 | P+,A,E,Q,D,N,O,M,B-,F,J,H,G,K,C,L,I |
| National board certification | 1.78 | .0289 | J,P+,F,I,A,D,M,B,H,E,G,Q,C,N,O,L,K- |
| Requirement for homework | 3.97 | .0000 | J,F+,B-,G,E,H,D,Q,I,O,M,K,P-,N,A-,L,C<br>J+,F+,B+,G,E,D+,Q,I,O,M,K,P,N,A-,L,C |
| Teach only in subject major | 2.45 | .0011 | F+,G,E,H,K,M,C,I,N,O,D-,A-,B-,P-,J,Q,L |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 2.90 | .0001 | M,G+,N,J,F,P,Q,E,H,L,K,A-,C,O,D-,B-,I |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 1.89 | .0180 | I,N,G,J,Q,F,M,H,O,L,B+,D,E,P,K,A-,C |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 2.88 | .0001 | M+,J,I,Q,F,G,N,H,E,L,B,O,D,P,K,A-,C |

KEY:

| | |
|---|---|
| A= Early Childhood | I= Art |
| B= Elementary | J= Music |
| C= Middle Grades | K= Business |
| D= Reading | L= Home Economics |
| E= English | M= Vocational |
| F= Math | N= Foreign Language |
| G= Science | O= Health & PE |
| H= Social Studies | P= Special Ed. |
| | Q = Media/Guidance |

| Grade Point Average | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Differentiated staffing | 2.41 | .0474 | 4, 0, 3,5-, 3.99, 2.5-2.99, 3.0-3.49, 2.0-2.49 |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 2.73 | .0277 | 3.5-3.99, 2.5-2.99, 3.0-3.49, 4.0, 2.0-2.49 |
| Public ed. of four years olds | 2.56 | .0371 | 2.5-2.99+, 2.0-2.49, 3.0-3.49, 3.5-3.99, 4.0 |

**Table 10 continued**

| Most Influential Person | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 3.97 | .0003 | OTH+,HST,FA-,FR,CO,HSP,ET-,EP |
| | | | OTH+,HST+,FA+,FR,CO,HSP,ET-,EP |
| Differential staffing | 3.05 | .0035 | FR+,OTH+,ET+,HSP,FA+,EP,HST+,CO- |
| Longer school days | 2.58 | .0121 | OHT+,CO,HST,ET,FA-,HSP,FR-,EP |
| Mentor teachers | 2.56 | .0126 | ET+,FR,EP,FA-,HST-,CO,HSP,OTH- |

KEY:

| | |
|---|---|
| F= Family member | HP= High School Principal |
| ET= Elementary Teacher | SC= School Counselor |
| EP= Elementary Principal | FR= Friend |
| HT= High School Teacher | O= Other |

| Family Member In Education | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Differentiated staffing | 4.49 | .0342 | Yes+, No- |
| Increased academic curriculum | 5.61 | .0180 | Yes+, No- |
| College/school partnerships | 4.81 | .0284 | Yes+, No- |

| Age First Interested | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 6.61 | .0000 | >25+,22to25+,19to21-,16to18-,<12-,12to15- |
| Differentiated staffing | 4.20 | .0009 | <12+,22to25,>25,19to21,12to15-,16to18- |
| Longer school days | 2.26 | .0465 | >25,19to21,12to15,<12,16to18,22to25 |
| Longer school years | 2.59 | .0245 | >25+,<12,19to21,12to15,22to25,16to18- |
| Mentor teachers | 2.57 | .0252 | <12+,12to15,19to21,22to25,>25,16to18- |
| Public ed. of four year olds | 2.28 | .0449 | 12to15,19to21+,16to18+,<12,22to25,>25- |

| Current Age | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 3.43 | .0084 | 61to70,41to50+,51to60,31to40,21to30- |
| Career ladder | 7.87 | .0000 | 61to70,21to30+,51to60-,31to40-,41to50- |
| | | | 61to70,21to30+,51to60,31to40+,41to50- |
| Performance based certification | 4.15 | .0024 | 61to70,21to30+,51to60-,41to50-,31to40- |
| Differentiated staffing | 2.47 | .0430 | 21to30+,31to40-,41to50,51to60-,61to70 |
| Higher teacher salaries | 5.16 | .0004 | 21to30+,31to40,41to50-,61to70,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,31to40,41to50+,61to70,51to60- |
| Increased academic curriculum | 3.48 | .0078 | 21to30+,51to60+,41to50+,31to40+,61to70- |

**Table 10 continued**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 8.31 | .0000 | 61to70,51to60+,41to50+,31to40-,21to30- |
| | | | 61to70,51to60+,41to50+,31to40+,21to30- |
| Longer school days | 3.89 | .0038 | 61to70+,51to60-,41to50-,31to40-,21to30- |
| Longer school years | 5.89 | .0001 | 61to70+,51to60-,41to50-,21to30-,31to40- |
| | | | 61to70+,51to60,41to50+,21to30,31to40- |
| Mentor teachers | 6.85 | .0000 | 21to30+,61to70,31to40-,41to50-,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,61to70,31to40+,41to50,51to60- |
| More federal funding | 18.77 | .0000 | 21to30+,31to40-,61to70,41to50-,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,31to40+,61to70,41to50-,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,31to40+,61to70, 41to50+,51to60- |
| More state funding | 6.24 | .0001 | 21to30+,31to40-,41to50-,61to70,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,31to40+,41to50,61to70,51to60- |
| National board certification | 10.90 | .0000 | 21to30+,61to70,31to40-,41to50-,51to60- |
| | | | 21to30+,61to70,31to40+,41to50+,51to60- |
| College/school partnerships | 6.21 | .0001 | 21to30+,31to40-,41to50-,51to60-,61to70 |
| | | | 21to30+,31to40+,41to50,51to60-,61to70 |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 3.23 | .0120 | 61to70,21to30+,41to50-,51to60,31to40- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 5.92 | .0001 | 51to60+,61to70,41to50+,21to30+,31to40- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 3.60 | .0063 | 61to70,51to60+,41to50-,21to30-,31to40- |

| Sex | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abolish undergraduate major | 17.81 | .0000 | Male+, Female- |
| Increased academic curriculum | 18.04 | .0000 | Female+, Male- |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 16.44 | .0001 | Female+, Male- |
| Longer school days | 4.33 | .0376 | Male+, Female- |
| Longer school years | 10.31 | .0014 | Male+,Female- |
| Mentor teachers | 13.52 | .0002 | Female+, Male- |
| More federal funding | 10.69 | .0011 | Female+,Male- |
| National board certification | 12.57 | .0004 | Female+, Male- |
| Public ed. of four year olds | 4.36 | .0371 | Female+, Male- |
| Requirement for homework | 6.31 | .0121 | Male+, Female- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 9.45 | .0021 | Male+, Female- |

**Table 10 continued**

| Race | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Career ladder | 7.18 | .0008 | White+, Other, Black- |
| Performance based certification | 13.99 | .0000 | White+, Other, Black- |
| Differentiated staffing | 12.86 | .0000 | White+, Black-, Other |
| Mentor teachers | 4.46 | .0117 | White+, Black-, Other |
| More federal funding | 20.04 | .0000 | Black+, White-, Other |
| More state funding | 4.37 | .0129 | Black+, White-, Other |
| Public ed. of four year olds | 59.87 | .0000 | Black+, Other, White- |
| Requirement for homework | 9.05 | .0001 | Black+, Other, White- |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 14.13 | .0000 | Other, White+, Black- |

| Years Experience | ratio | prob. | direction of significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Career ladder | 11.05 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10-,11to15-,>20-,16to20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15,>20,16to20- |
| Performance based certification | 9.00 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15-16to20-,>20- |
| Differentiated staffing | 4.08 | .0027 | 0to5+,6to10,11to15,>20-,16to20- |
| Higher teacher salaries | 3.96 | .0034 | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15+,16to20-,>20- |
| Less emphasis on athletics, etc | 3.06 | .0160 | 16to20+,>20+,11to15+,6to10,0to5- |
| Longer school years | 2.72 | .0283 | 16to20+,>20+,6to10,0to5,11to15- |
| Mentor teachers | 6.32 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15,16to20,>20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10,11to15-,16to20-,>20- |
| More federal funding | 10.86 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10-,11to15-,16to20-,>20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15,16to20->20- |
| More state funding | 4.34 | .0017 | 0to5+,6to10,11to15,16to20-,>20- |
| National board certification | 10.01 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10,11to15-,16to20-,>20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15,16to20-,>20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15+,16to20,>20- |
| College/school partnerships | 8.59 | .0000 | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15-,>20-,16to20- |
| Teach only in subject major | 4.96 | .0006 | >20+,6to10+,11to15+,16to20,0to5- |
| Stand. testing of teachers | 6.12 | .0001 | 0to5+,6to10,11to15-,>20-,16to20- |
| | | | 0to5+,6to10+,11to15,>20-,16to20- |
| Stand. tests at every grade | 5.68 | .0002 | >20+,0to5-,6to10-,16to20-,11to15- |
| Stand. tests for promotion | 2.59 | .0351 | >20+,0to5,6to10,11to15-,16to20- |

# APPENDIX C

**REFERENCES**

References

Alexander, L. (1986). Summary of time for results (Report on education governor's group). The Chronicle for Higher Education, 78-79.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. A report commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation.

Darden Research Corporation. (1981). Teacher attrition study: State of Georgia. A report commissioned by Governor George Busbee.

Feinberg, W. (1987). The holmes group report and the professionalization of teaching. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 366-377.

Gallup, A. M. (1988). The 20th annual gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(1), 33-46.

Holmes Group Report. (1986). Tommorrow's teachers. A report developed by The Holmes Group, a consortium of education deans and chief academic officers from the major research universities.

Jordan, L. (1988). Characteristics of high school seniors selecting teaching as a career preference. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

Lacetti, S. (1988, February 28). Funding for QBE is tardy. Atlanta Journal and Constitution, pp. 1, 4B.

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk.

National Governor's Association. (1986). Time for results.

Page, F. M. (1982). Children without teachers: A crisis in the making. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(6), 45.

Page, J. A. (1983). Pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions of the teaching profession: Optimism versus realism. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(9), 662-663.

Page, J. A., et. al. (1981). Most high school seniors ignore teaching career. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(7), 525.

Parker, F. (1987). School reform: Recent influences. National Forum: The Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 67(3), 32-33.

Romanish, B. (1987 May-June). A skeptical view of educational reform. Journal of Teacher Education, 9-12.

Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1989 March). Education reform in the 1980's: Lessons from the states. Phi Delta Kappan, 504-11.